UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/060,990	01/30/2002	Yizhong Gu	PB0176	6593

7590 09/30/2003

Stephen G. Ryan
Amersham Biosciences
800 Centennial Avenue
Piscataway, NJ 08855

EXAMINER
LY, CHEYNE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1631	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/060,990	GU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cheyne D Ly	1631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondenc_ address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 August 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-47* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *7,12-31 and 34-38* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8-11,32,33 and 39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *1-47* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election with traversal of Group I, claims 1-6, 8-11, 32, 33, and 39, SEQ ID NO. 1, filed August 21, 2003, is acknowledged.

The traversal is on the ground(s) that it would not be unduly burdensome to perform a search on SEQ ID NOs: 1, 2, 3, 4, and 8 together. This is not found persuasive because, due to the number of these requests made, it is practically impossible to accommodate all requests. The overwhelming number of sequences poses undue search burden when more than one nucleic acid sequence is elected, thus making the previous waiver to a complete search of all of the sequences of this instant application, effectively impossible to reasonably implement.

2. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

3. Applicant's amendments to the Brief Description of the Drawings and revised figures have been accepted.

4. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 32, 33, and 39, SEQ ID NO. 1, are examined on the merits.

OBJECTIONS

5. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code (page 7, lines 4 and 5; page 20, line 9; and page 129, lines 6-8). Applicant(s) is/are required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code, or inactivate the hyperlink. See MPEP § 608.01.

LACK OF UTILITY UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

6. The pending claims have been reviewed in light of the Utility Examination Guidelines and Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph,

"Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1092-1111, Friday, January 5, 2001.

7. The examiner is using the following definitions in evaluating the claims for utility.

"Specific" - A utility that is *specific* to the subject matter claimed. This contrasts with a *general* utility that would be applicable to the broad class of the invention.

"Substantial" - A utility that defines a "real world" use. Utilities that require or constitute carrying out further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use are not substantial utilities.

"Credible" - Credibility is assessed from the perspective of one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the disclosure and any other evidence of record that is probative of the applicant's assertions. That is, the assertion is an inherently unbelievable undertaking or involves implausible scientific principles.

"Well-established" - a specific, substantial, and credible utility which is well known, immediately apparent, or implied by the specification's disclosure of the properties of a material, alone or taken with the knowledge of one skilled in the art.

35 U.S.C. § 101 reads as follows:

"Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title".

8. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 32, 33, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility due to its not being supported by a specific, substantial, and credible utility or, in the alternative, a well-established utility.

9. The critical limitation of claims 1-6, 8-11, 32, 33, and 39 is the polynucleotide SEQ ID NO: 1. While some data are supplied for several sequences, such as for RGL3 in Tables 1 and 2 on pages 125 and 127, no data therein indicate any specificity regarding the elected SEQ ID NO: 1. The claimed nucleic acid is not supported by a specific asserted utility because the other

disclosed uses (not specified for any particular sequence) mentioned in the specification are generally applicable to many nucleic acids. The specification states that the polynucleotide sequences may be useful as a hybridization probe (page 27) and antisense inhibitor (page 29). The above-mentioned list of desirable utility for the claimed sequence falls short of a readily available utility. These are non-specific uses that are applicable to nucleic acids in general and not particular or specific to the polynucleotide being claimed.

10. Further, the claimed polynucleotide is not supported by a substantial utility because no substantial utility has been established for the claimed subject matter. For example, a nucleic acid may be utilized to obtain a protein. The protein could then be used in conducting research to functionally characterize the protein. A starting material that can only be used to produce a final product does not have substantial asserted utility in those instances where the final product is not supported by a specific and substantial utility. In this case, the protein produced as a final product resulting from processes involving the nucleic acid does not have asserted or identified specific and substantial utilities. Identifying and studying the properties of a protein itself or the mechanisms in which the protein is involved, such as the RGL3 encoded by SEQ ID NO: 1, does not define a "real world" context for use. Similarly, the other listed utilities and asserted utilities as summarized above or in the instant specification are neither substantial nor specific due to being generic in nature and applicable to many such compounds.

11. Further, Applicants disclose RGL3 cDNA is closely related to sequences known in the art via BLAST query into the GenBank database (page 126, line 28 to page 129, line 10). It is noted that applicant has identified a sequence which is known in the prior art and which has a stated sequence similarity to the claimed sequence. Absent factual evidence, one skilled in the art

would have reason to doubt that sequence similarity alone would reasonably support the assertion that the biological activity of the claimed subject matter would be the same as that of the similar sequence. Furthermore, it is unclear whether the similar sequence identified in the prior art has actually been tested for the biological activity or whether this also is an asserted biological activity based upon sequence similarity to yet a different sequence. Note that it would have been well known in the art that sequence similarity does not reliably correlate to structural similarity and that structural similarity does not reliably result in similar or identical biological activities. For example, it would have been well known that even a single nucleotide or amino acid change or mutation can destroy the function of the biomolecule in many instances, albeit not in all cases. In the absence of factual evidence characterizing the structural and functional components of the biomolecule, the effects of these changes are largely unpredictable as to which ones will have a significant effect and which ones will be silent mutations having no effect. Several publications document the unpredictability of the relationship between sequence, structure, and function, although it is acknowledged that certain specific sequences have been found to be conserved in biomolecules having related function following a significant amount of further research. See Lopez et al. (Molecular Biology, 32:881-891,1999); Attwood (Science, 290:471-473, 2000); Gerhold et al. (BioEssays, 18(12):973-981, 1996); Wells et al. (Journal of Leukocyte Biology, 61(5):545-550, 1997); and Russell et al. (Journal of Molecular Biology, 244:332-350, 1994). However, this level of factual evidence is absent here.

Claims Rejected Under U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

12. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to

which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

LACK OF ENABLEMENT

13. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 32, 33, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the claimed sequence. For a sequence putatively assigned a biological function, even if correct, does not appear to be defined as to what use it is to be applied to. The significance of the sequence is undefined, further rendering it indiscernible how someone of skill in the art would use such an entity.

14. The claimed invention is not supported by a specific, substantial, and credible utility or a well-established utility for the reasons set forth above (refer to 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection), one skilled in the art would not know how to use the claimed invention.

LACK OF WRITTEN DESCRIPTION

15. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 32, 33, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

16. The specification discloses SEQ ID NO: 1 which corresponds to DNA encoding RGL3. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 32, 33, and 39 are directed to encompass gene sequences, sequences that are complementary to the antisense sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1, and variants. None of these sequences meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The

specification provides insufficient written description to support the genus encompassed by the claim.

> Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, whatever is now claimed." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.)

17. With the exception of SEQ ID NO: 1, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed polynucleotides and/or proteins, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method for isolating it. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993) and Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmacentical Co. Ltd., 18 USPQ2d 1016. In Fiddes v. Baird, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

> University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404, 1405 held that: ...To fulfill the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe an invention and do so in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can clearly conclude that "the inventor invented the claimed invention." Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc. , 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (1997); In *re Gosteli* , 872 F.2d 1008, 1012, 10 USPQ2d 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (" [T]he description must clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [the inventor] invented what is claimed."). Thus, an applicant complies with the written description requirement "by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which makes it obvious," and by using "such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention." *Lockwood* , 107 F.3d at 1572, 41 USPQ2d at 1966.

18. Therefore, only SEQ ID NO: 1 but not the full breadth of the claims 1-6, 8-11, 32, 33, and 39 meet the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The species

specifically disclosed are not representative of the genus because the genus is highly variant. Applicant is reminded that Vas-Cath makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision. (See page 1115.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

2. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 32, 33, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by Shao et al. (2000).

19. Shao et al. discloses a nucleic acid that encodes RGL3 protein, an effector for Rit and Ras, wherein the nucleotide sequence (AF237669, 2.2 kb) of less than 100 kb in length. The nucleotide sequence of Shao et al. (position 1-6) is complementary SEQ ID NO. 1 (position 12-17) of the instant application, as in claims 1 and 2.

20. A nucleic probe of the AF237669 sequence is labeled with $^{[32]}$P and attached to a substrate (page 26915, column 2, Northern Blotting §), as in instant claims 4-6.

21. The AF237669 sequence has been sub-cloned into expression vector wherein it is linked to a promoter and transformed into a host cell (page 26915, column 1, Two-hybrid Screen § and column 2, Construction of Plasmid Construction §), as in instant claims 8-11.

CONCLUSION

22. NO CLAIM IS ALLOWED.

23. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 193), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center number is either (703) 308-4242 or (703) 305-3014.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Dune Ly, whose telephone number is (703) 308-3880. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

25. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (703) 308-4028.

26. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instruments Examiner, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3524 or to the Technical Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

C. Dune Ly
9/23/03

ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER